



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/682,631	10/01/2001	Kirk Feathers	011281	2276
23464	7590	05/07/2004	EXAMINER	
BUCHANAN INGERSOLL, P.C. ONE OXFORD CENTRE, 301 GRANT STREET 20TH FLOOR PITTSBURGH, PA 15219			ARSHAD, UMAR	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2174	3
DATE MAILED: 05/07/2004				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>
	09/682,631	FEATHERS ET AL.
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>
	Umar Arshad	2174

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 October 2001.
- 2a) This action is FINAL.                    2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-40 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-40 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)                     |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)   | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .  |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date 1. | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
|  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ .                                  |

## DETAILED ACTION

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 29 recites the limitation "said modifying step" in line 1. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. The examiner interprets this claim to be dependent on claim 28.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1, 2, 5 – 8, 11 – 13, 14, 15, 18 – 21 and 24 - 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Leshem et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,870,559.

As per claim 1, Leshem et al. teach a method of organizing and displaying a

Art Unit: 2174

plurality of hyperlink addresses associated with a plurality of corresponding web site pages on a portal page comprising the steps of:

providing a visual representation of a map having a plurality of active areas thereon, said active areas representing individual hyperlinks or a plurality of hyperlinks having a common theme (see Leshem, figure 1, column 2, lines 25 – 41 and column 8, lines 49 – 58); and

modifying said map to provide information regarding said common theme when a cursor is placed over one of said active areas (see Leshem, figure 3 and column 10, lines 32 – 35).

As per claim 2, which is dependent on claim 1, Leshem teaches the method of claim 1 (see rejection above). Leshem further teaches the method of claim 1 further comprising the step of: grouping said active areas such that active areas related by a common concept are placed on said map in close proximity to each other (see Leshem, column 2, lines 35 – 41).

As per claim 5, which is dependent on claim 1, Leshem teaches the method of claim 1 (see rejection above). Leshem further teaches the method of claim 1 further comprising the step of: displaying a button which, when selected by a user, will re-display said map, without regard to where said user has navigated (see Leshem, figure 1 and column 16, lines 16 – 20; the examiner interprets sizing a map to fit within window as re-displaying the map without regards to where the user has navigated).

As per claim 6, which is dependent on claim 1, Leshem teaches the method of claim 1 (see rejection above). Leshem further teaches the method of claim 1 further comprising the step of: displaying a navigation bar having a plurality of buttons corresponding to said plurality of, active areas on said map (see Leshem, figure 1, item 46 and column 16, lines 14 – 22).

As per claim 7, which is dependent on claim 1, Leshem teaches the method of claim 1 (see rejection above). Leshem further teaches the method of claim 1 comprising the step of: temporarily displaying static images at random locations on said map (see Leshem, figure 2).

As per claim 8, which is dependent on claim 1, Leshem teaches the method of claim 1 (see rejection above). Leshem further teaches the method of claim 7 wherein said images contain hyperlinks to web pages (see Leshem, column 8, lines 49 – 58).

As per claim 11, which is dependent on claim 1, Leshem teaches the method of claim 1 (see rejection above). Leshem further teaches the method of claim 1 wherein said plurality of web site pages associated with said plurality of hyperlink addresses are culturally localized (see Leshem, column 8, lines 49 – 67).

As per claim 12, which is dependent on claim 1, Leshem teaches the method of

claim 1 (see rejection above). Leshem further teaches the method of claim 11 further comprising the step of customizing said visual representation to provide a cultural theme, said cultural theme being associated with said plurality of culturally localized web site pages (see Leshem, column 9, lines 1 – 11).

As per claim 13, which is dependent on claim 1, Leshem teaches the method of claim 1 (see rejection above). Leshem further teaches the method of claim 12 further comprising the step of providing a link which, when activated, displays a listing of one or more other portal pages, each of which has a visual representation customized for a different culture (see Leshem, column 9, lines 1 – 11 and column 10, line 36 – 43; it is inherent that the an HTML document will load with the visual representation customized for the culture indicated by the visual representation of the URL icon).

As per claims 14, 15, 18 – 21 and 24 - 26, they are of similar scope to claims 1, 2, 5 – 8, and 11 – 13 respectively and are rejected under the same rationale.

Claims 27, 30, 33 – 35, and 37 – 40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by de Hond, U.S. Patent No. 5,737,533.

As per claim 27, de Hond teaches a method of accessing a plurality of web site pages by collecting, organizing and visually presenting representations of a plurality of

hyperlink addresses associated with said web site pages, said method comprising:

displaying a plurality of buildings on a map layout wherein each of said buildings are representative of categories of information items having a common theme (see de Hond, column 8, lines 62 – 65);

organizing each of said plurality of buildings into districts, said districts representative of a common concept among said buildings illustrated therein (see de Hond, column 9, lines 22 – 38).

As per claim 30, which is dependent on claim 27, de Hond teaches the method of claim 27 (see rejection above). De Hond further teaches the method of claim 27 wherein said buildings represent a plurality of commercial or retail establishments (see de Hond, column 6, lines 56 – 59).

As per claim 33, which is dependent on claim 27, de Hond teaches the method of claim 27 (see rejection above). De Hond further teaches the method of claim 27 further comprising the step of temporarily displaying static or moving images at random locations on said map (see de Hond, figure 7, item 100 and column 9, lines 5 – 15).

As per claim 34, which is dependent on claim 33, de Hond teaches the method of claim 33 (see rejection above). De Hond further teaches the method of claim 33 wherein said images display advertisements for said commercial or retail establishments (see de Hond, figure 7, item 100 and column 9, lines 5 – 15).

As per claim 35, which is dependent on claim 33, de Hond teaches the method of claim 33 (see rejection above). De Hond further teaches the method of claim 33 wherein said images contain hyperlinks to said commercial and retail establishments (see de Hond, column 9, lines 16 – 18).

As per claim 37 which is dependent on claim 27, de Hond teaches the method of claim 27 (see rejection above). De Hond discloses the step of displaying said hyperlinks in a textual fashion (see de Hond, column 2, lines 58 – 63).

As per claim 38, which is dependent on claim 27, de Hond teaches the method of claim 27 (see rejection above). De Hond further teaches the method of claim 27 wherein said plurality of web site pages associated with said plurality of hyperlink addresses are culturally localized (see de Hond, column 9, lines 22 - 38).

As per claim 39, which is dependent on claim 38, de Hond teaches the method of claim 38 (see rejection above). De Hond further teaches the method of claim 38 further comprising the step of customizing said map layout to provide a cultural theme, said cultural theme being associated with said plurality of culturally localized web site pages (see de Hond, column 9, lines 22 - 38).

As per claim 40, which is dependent on claim 39, de Hond teaches the method of

claim 39 (see rejection above). De Hond further teaches the method of claim 39 further comprising the step of providing a link which, when activated, displays a listing of one or more other map layouts, each of which is customized for a different culture (see de Hond, column 9, lines 22 - 38).

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 3, 4, 16 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Leshem et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,870,559 in view of Lynch et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,689,669.

As per claim 3, which is dependent on claim 1, Leshem teaches the method of claim 1. Leshem does not teach the method of claim 1 wherein said active areas are shown as representations of buildings on said map. Lynch teaches wherein active areas are shown as representations of buildings on said map (see Lynch, figures 5A

Art Unit: 2174

and 5B and column 8, lines 39 – 51). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the method of Lynch with the method of Leshem in order to provide a memorable and intuitive method of navigation through a system.

As per claim 4, which is dependent on claim 3, Leshem and Lynch teach the method of claim 3. Leshem teaches displaying a plurality of hyperlinks having a common theme (see rejections above). Leshem does not teach the method of claim 3 further comprising the steps of displaying the interior of a building when said active area represented by said building is selected; and displaying said plurality of hyperlinks having a common theme on the interior of said building. Lynch teaches the steps of displaying the interior of a building when said active area represented by said building is selected; and displaying said plurality of links having a common theme on the interior of said building (see Lynch, column 5, lines 25 – 36, column 7, lines 36 – 48 and column 8, lines 40 – 42). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the method of Lynch with the method of Leshem in order to provide a more memorable and intuitive method of navigation through a system.

As per claims 16 and 17 they are of similar scope to claims 3 and 4 respectively and are rejected under the same rationale.

Claims 9, 10, 22 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Leshem et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,870,559 in view of Miyashita et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,057,856.

As per claim 9, which is dependent on claim 1, Leshem teaches the method of claim 1 (see rejection above). Leshem teaches temporally displaying images across said map (see rejections above). Leshem does not teach the method of claim 1 further comprising the step of: temporarily displaying images which appear to move across said map. Miyashita teaches temporarily displaying images which appear to move across a map (see Miyashita, figure 9 and column 10, line 52 – column 11, line 7; the examiner interprets avatars as images which appear to move across a map). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time of the invention to incorporate the method of Miyashita with the method of Leshem in order to allow a user to easily recognize the position of another user sharing a three-dimensional virtual reality space.

As per claim 10, which is dependent on claim 9, Leshem and Miyashita teach the method of claim 9. Leshem further teaches the method of claim 9 wherein said images contain hyperlinks to web pages (see Leshem, column 8, lines 49 – 58).

As per claims 22 and 23, they are of similar scope to claims 9 and 10 respectively and are rejected under the same rationale.

Claims 28 and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over de Hond, U.S. Patent No. 5,737,533 in view of Kelts, U.S. Patent Application Publication No. US 2001/0030667.

As per claim 28, which is dependent on claim 27, de Hond teaches the method of claim 27 (see rejection above). De Hond does not teach the method of claim 27 further comprising the step of: modifying the appearance of said buildings when a cursor is placed thereover. Kelts teaches modifying the appearance of items on a map when a cursor is placed thereover (see Kelts, paragraph 0224). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time of the invention to incorporate the method of Kelts with the method of de Hond in order to provide an improved system of relating information to the user.

As per claim 29, which is dependent on claim 28, de Hond teaches the method of claim 28 (see rejection above). De Hond does not teach the method of claim 28 wherein said modifying step comprises displaying information relating to said common theme. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time of the invention to incorporate the method of Kelts with the method of de Hond in order to allow a user to easily and quickly determine the status of map elements by traversing the map with a pointing device.

Claims 31 and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over de Hond, U.S. Patent No. 5,737,533 in view of Lynch et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,689,669.

As per claim 31, which is dependent on claim 27, de Hond teaches the method of claim 27 (see rejection above). De Hond does not teach the method of claim 27 further comprising the step of displaying a navigation bar. Lynch teaches the step of displaying a navigation bar (see Lynch, figure 3, item 180 and column 7, lines 5 – 18). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the method of Lynch with the method of de Hond in order to provide for an improved method of navigation through virtual space.

As per claim 32, which is dependent on claim 31, de Hond and Lynch teach the method of claim 31 (see rejection above). De Hond does not teach the method of claim 31 wherein said navigation bar dynamically changes based on the position and/or interaction of a cursor with respect to said districts. Lynch teaches wherein said navigation bar dynamically changes based on the position and/or interaction of a cursor with respect to the location of the user (see Lynch, figure 3, item 180 and column 7, lines 5 – 18). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the method of Lynch with the method of de Hond in order to provide for an improved method of navigation through virtual space.

Claim 36 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over de Hond, U.S. Patent No. 5,737,533 in view of Leshem et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,870,559.

As per claim 36, which is dependent on claim 27, de Hond teaches the method of claim 27 (see rejection above). De Hond does not teach the method of claim 27 further comprising the step of providing a means for a user to return to said map display, without regard to where said user has navigated using said hyperlinks. Leshem teaches the step of providing a means for a user to return to said map display, without regard to where said user has navigated (see Leshem, figure 1 and column 16, lines 16 – 20; the examiner interprets sizing a map to fit within window as re-displaying the map without regards to where the user has navigated). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time of the invention to incorporate the method of Leshem with the method of de Hond in order to allow a user to zoom out and fit the map on the screen in order to improve navigation.

***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Umar Arshad whose telephone number is (703) 305-0329. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, 9am - 5:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kristine L Kincaid can be reached on (703) 308-0640. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

UA

*Kristine Kincaid*  
KRISTINE KINCAID  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100